

RAY K. SHAHANI  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Registered Patent Attorney - Technology and Intellectual Property Matters  
<http://www.attycubed.com>

Twin Oaks Office Plaza  
477 Ninth Avenue, Suite 112  
San Mateo, California 94402-1854

Telephone: (650) 348-1444  
Facsimile: (650) 348-8655  
e-mail: [rks@attycubed.com](mailto:rks@attycubed.com)

10/3  
MKT  
3-5-03  
EP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	)	AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 9
AKBARIAN ET AL.	)	MAILED 11/29/02
Serial No.: 09/620,892	)	
Filing Date: July 21, 2000	)	Date Mailed: <u>February 28, 2003</u>
Attorney Docket No.: CLX-501	)	
(316.36)	)	
Title: DRY-CLEANING	)	
PROCESSES AND	)	Examiner: KUMAR, Preeti.
COMPONENTS THEREFOR	)	Group Art Unit: 1751
	)	
	)	

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 9 MAILED 11/29/02

Dear Sir,

Applicant is in receipt of Paper No. 9 mailed 11/29/02. Thank you for your continued expedient examination of the present Application.

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS STATUS

Claims 4-9, 34-53, 56-62 are pending.

Claims 4-9, 34-53, 56-62 stand rejected.

FAX REC'D  
MAR 03 2003  
GROUP 1

Amendment and Response to Paper No. 9 Mailed 11/29/02  
Filing Date: July 21, 2000  
Date Mailed: February 28, 2003

Title: DRY-CLEANING PROCESSES AND COMPONENTS THEREFOR  
Serial No.: 09/620,892  
Attorney Docket No.: CLX-501  
(316.36)

Page 1 of 12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

*Detailed Action*

1. The examiner states: " Claims 4-9, 34-53, 56-62 are pending."
2. The examiner states: " The objection of claim 54 is withdrawn in light of applicant's filed September 16, 2002 in paper no.8."
3. The examiner states: " The rejection of claims 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment."
4. The examiner states: " The rejection of claims 4-9, 34-36, 38-42 and 46-53 and 56-62 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by You et al. (WO 97/27354) is maintained for the reasons cited in the previous office action and further described below."
5. The examiner states: " The rejection if claims 37 and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over You et al. (WO 97/27354) is maintained for the reasons cited in the previous office action and further described below."
6. The examiner states: " Applicant's arguments filed September 16, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's arguments, You et al. do teach pretreatment of localized stains, placing an activator cloth containing an activator solution together with the textile article into a heat resistant containment means Specifically on page 6, You et al. teach that when treating a fabric ( such as a soiled, wrinkled or malodorous garment), the item is first inspected for heavily spotted areas. If none are found, the item being treated is placed in the vapor-venting containment bag of this invention together with the cleaning/refreshment article herein and tumbled in a hot air clothes dryer in the manner disclosed, i.e., the "in-dryer" step. If heavily spotted areas are found, it is preferred to treat them individually before the in-dryer step. In order to conduct this pre-spotting step, the user has several choices, as follows. (A) The spots can be individually treated with conventional spot

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

removers using conventional implements such as brushes, sponges, and the like. (B) The spots can be individually treated by laying the spotted area of the fabric over the article herein and pressing downward (Z-direction) with a brush, more preferably with a convex device. (C) In a third and more preferred option, the user is provided with a separate portion of a pre-spotting composition. In-use, this is directed onto the stained area of the fabrics, and worked-in using the convex cleaning device. Optionally, the fabric being treated can be situated over a stain receiver or other absorbent material during the step. This option has the advantage that the liquid composition used in the pre-spotting step can be formulated differently from that used in the in-dryer step. For example, the pre-spotting composition can optionally contain higher solvent levels than the in-dryer composition. Or, the prespotting composition can contain peroxides, surfactant levels, and the like, which are sub-optimal for use in the in-dryer step. Alternatively, the pre-spotting and in-dryer compositions can be the same. However, the formulator, has more degrees of freedom when operating in this manner. After this pre-spotting step, the fabric and cleaning/refreshment article are then placed loosely in the vapor-venting containment bag herein and tumbled together, preferably in hot air clothes dryer. Please see all of page 6. Clearly, You et al. teach pretreatment of localized stains. Specifically regarding the activator cloth, You et al. teach a stain receiver comprising Functional Absorbent Materials ("FAM's") which are in the form of water-absorbent foams having a controlled capillary size. The physical structure and resulting of FAM-type foams provide very effective water absorption, while at the same time the chemical composition of the FAM typically renders it highly lipophilic. Thus, the FAM can essentially provide both hydrophilicity and lipophilicity simultaneously. (FAM foams can be treated to render them hydrophilic. Both the hydrophobic or hydrophilic FAM can be used herein.) For pre-spotting, the stained area of the garment or fabric swatch is placed over a section of FAM, followed by the treatment with an aqueous or non-aqueous cleaning solution in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

conjunction with the use of the cleaning device herein to provide mechanical agitation. Repeated rocking with the device and the detergency effect of the solution serve to loosen the soil and transfer it to the FAM. While spot, cleaning progresses, the suction effects of the FAM capillaries cause the cleaning solution and stain debris to be carried into the FAM, where the stain debris is largely retained. At the end of this step the stain as well as almost all of the cleaning solution is found to have been removed from the fabric being treated and transferred to the FAM. This leaves the fabric surface only damp, with a minimum residue of the cleaning solution/stain debris which can lead to undesirable rings on the fabrics. Please see page 33, second and third paragraphs. As for the argument that the use as a pretreater and the use of a stain receiver are "optional", the examiner redirects the applicant's attention to examples V and XI as stated in the previous office action. Furthermore, specifically regarding newly added claims 59-62, examiner asserts that example V and XI as recited in the previous office action encompasses the limitations of these newly added claims."

7. The examiner states: " **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**"

#### AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

///